UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,074	08/19/2003	Robert L. Alcorn	114049.130(US1)	3054

41552   7590   09/25/2007
MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
4370 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE, SUITE 700
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122

EXAMINER
QIAN, SONGWEI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2191	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/643,074	ALCORN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Songwei Qian	2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _07/19/2007_.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.** 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-16_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-16_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _08/07/2007_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail. Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-16 are pending in this application.

2.   Claims 1-6 were amended by applicant on July 19, 2007.

3.   Claims 7-16 were newly added by applicant on July 19, 2007.

Claim Objections

4.   Claims 8, 11, and 15 are objected because the newly added claims in the
amendment filed on July 19, 2007 contain new subject matter "the plug-in manager is
invoked using user interface".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6.   Claims 8, 11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing
to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter
"the plug-in manager is invoked using user interface" which was not described in the
specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that

the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed

invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Heller et al. (Philip Heller and Simon Roberts, "JAVA 2 Developer's Handbook", SYBEX,

September 1998), hereinafter "Heller", in view of Parker et al. (US Pat. # 5,909,589),

hereinafter "Parker".

9.   As for claim 1, Heller discloses:

        A method for providing an extensible educational system, the method comprising

the steps of:

        installing (Copy, Page 883, Line 24) on a server (web server, Page 177, Lines

22-24) a file (the archive called Smart.jar, Page 883, Line 24 and MyAppletStuff.jar,

Page 179, lines 19-22) compatible with a known system application program interface

(API) (JAVA API, Page 6, Line 17), wherein the installed file (MyAppletStuff.jar) utilizes

the known API to provide a modified user interface (GUI, Page 96, Line 12) to at least

one user of a system (Java Applications and web server, Page 18, line 1 and Page 177,

Lines 22-24);

invoking (provides) an enhanced system functionality (SmartCard, Page 878,

Line 26, and a smart card that provides management of keys, certificates, and medical

records, Page 878, Lines 23-24);

invoking a functionality (MyApplet, Page 179, line 19) by using the modified user

interface (GUI, Page 96, Line 12);

specifying in the file one or more roles of a user (SmartCardPermission.java

contains the Permission subclass, Page 878, Lines 27-28 and Page 882, lines 27-33)

that can utilize the system enhanced functionality (access to SmartCard, Page 878,

Lines 23-28);

determining if the user has rights (the permissions related to—typically, either a

single person or a group, Page 888, Lines 11-12) to utilize the enhanced system

functionality (access to SmartCard, Page 878, Lines 23-28) based on the role of the

user (permissions, Page 878, Lines 27-28 and Page 882, lines 27-33); and

if the user has rights, granting access to the user to utilize the enhanced system

functionality (access to SmartCard, Page 878, Lines 23-28).

However, Heller does not explicitly disclose:

a system is an educational system.

On the other hand, Parker discloses:

> a system is an educational system (the multimedia educational system of the present invention, Col. 8, lines 38-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Heller with the teachings of Parker by having a system to be an educational system in order to provide prospective students more choices for education and to reduce financial burdens for students to have training and education (Parker, Col. 1, lines 22-44).

10.   As for claim 2, Heller discloses:

> The method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of storing (loading) the one or more roles (permissions, Page 878, Lines 27-28 and Page 882, lines 27-33) into a system data repository (a database of permissions, Page 864, Line 8) (permissions are loaded into the policy from a file called .java.policy, Page 864, Lines 33-34 and the database that contains the Permission objects, which is known as the policy, Page 864, Lines 27-28).

11.   As for claim 3, Heller discloses:

> the enhanced system functionality (SmartCard, Page 878, Line 26, and a smart card that provides management of keys, certificates, and medical records, Page 878, Lines 23-24) is provided (is implemented) by at least one of a hyperlink and icon (an

icon) (An icon is an instance of a class that implements the Icon interface, Page 715,

Lines 3-4).

12.   As for claim 4, Heller discloses:

the one or more roles (permissions, Page 878, Lines 27-28 and Page 882, lines

27-33) comprise at least one of user administrator, course administrator, system

support, observer, support, portal administrator, system administrator, instructor and

teacher's assistant (read keys, write a key, write a certificate, read a certificate, read

medical notes, and read emergency notes, Page 882, Lines 18-23).

13.   As for claim 5, Heller discloses:

The method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of denying

access (control access) to the enhanced system functionality (access to SmartCard,

Page 878, Lines 23-28) if the user does not have access rights

(SmartCardPermission.java contains the Permission subclass that is used to control

access to SmartCard, Page 878, Lines 27-28).

14.   As for claim 6, Heller discloses:

the file (the archive called Smart.jar, Page 883, Line 28) is installed (Copy, Page

883, Line 24) on the server (web server, Page 177, Lines 22-24) by using a Java

archive file (the archive called Smart.jar, Page 883, Line 24 and MyAppletStuff.jar, Page

179, lines 19-22).

15.   Claims 7, 9-10, 12-14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Heller in view of Parker, and further in view of Kadel et al. (US Pub. #

2002/0184401 A1), hereinafter "Kadel".

16.   As for claim 7, Heller discloses:

An extensible system (Java Applications and web server, Page 18, line 1 and

Page 177, Lines 22-24) comprising:

a user interface (GUI, Page 96, Line 12);

add new functionality to the extensible system (the archive called Smart.jar, Page

883, Line 24 and MyAppletStuff.jar, Page 179, lines 19-22); and

an authentication interface configured (SmartCardPermission.java contains the

Permission subclass, Page 878, Lines 27-28 and Page 882, lines 27-33) to verify a role

of a user in the extensible system (the permissions related to—typically, either a single

person or a group, Page 888, Lines 11-12, Page 878, Lines 27-28, and Page 882, lines

27-33), and grant or deny a user access to the new functionality based on the role of the

user in the extensible system (access to SmartCard, Page 878, Lines 23-28), wherein

the role of a user comprises at least one of: user administrator, course administrator,

system support, observer, support, portal administrator, system administrator, instructor,

student and teacher's assistant (read keys, write a key, write a certificate, read a

certificate, read medical notes, and read emergency notes, Page 882, Lines 18-23).

However, Heller does not explicitly disclose:

an extensible system is an educational system;

an authentication user interface; and

a plug-in manager configured to add new functionality to the extensible system.

On the other hand, Parker discloses:

an extensible system is an educational system (the multimedia educational

system of the present invention, Col. 8, lines 38-41);

an authentication user interface (the student signs on in step 208, Col. 8, line 65

and FIG. 3A),

and Kadel discloses:

a plug-in manager configured to add new functionality to the extensible system

([0291] and [0082], lines 18-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was

made to combine the teachings of Heller with the teachings of Parker and Kadel by

having a system to be an educational system, having an authentication user interface,

and having a plug-in manager configured to add new functionality to the extensible

system in order to provide prospective students more choices for education, to reduce

financial burdens for students to have training and education (Parker, Col. 1, lines 22-

44), to control access to system resources (Heller, last two paragraphs of Page 848),

and to interpret and manipulate information in an increasingly wide variety of formats so

that data and processing software can be brought together in a compatible but also

timely and effective way (Kadel, [0008]).

17.   As for claim 9, Heller discloses:

A method for providing an extensible educational system, the method comprising:

displaying a user interface (GUI, Page 96, Line 12);

add new functionality to the extensible system (the archive called Smart.jar, Page

883, Line 24, MyAppletStuff.jar, Page 179, lines 19-22, and Java Applications and web

server, Page 18, line 1 and Page 177, Lines 22-24); and

invoking an authentication interface configured (SmartCardPermission.java

contains the Permission subclass, Page 878, Lines 27-28 and Page 882, lines 27-33) to

verify a role of a user in the extensible system (the permissions related to—typically,

either a single person or a group, Page 888, Lines 11-12, Page 878, Lines 27-28, and

Page 882, lines 27-33), and grant or deny a user access to the new functionality based

on the role of the user in the extensible system (access to SmartCard, Page 878, Lines

23-28).

However, Heller does not explicitly disclose:

an extensible system is an educational system;

an authentication user interface; and

invoking a plug-in manager configured to add new functionality to the extensible

system.

On the other hand, Parker discloses:

an extensible system is an educational system (the multimedia educational

system of the present invention, Col. 8, lines 38-41); and

an authentication user interface (the student signs on in step 208, Col. 8, line 65

and FIG. 3A),

and Kadel discloses:

invoking a plug-in manager configured to add new functionality to the extensible

system ([0291] and [0082], lines 18-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was

made to combine the teachings of Heller with the teachings of Parker and Kadel by

having a system to be an educational system, having an authentication user interface,

and invoking a plug-in manager configured to add new functionality to the extensible

system in order to provide prospective students more choices for education, to reduce

financial burdens for students to have training and education (Parker, Col. 1, lines 22-

44), to control access to system resources (Heller, last two paragraphs of Page 848),

and to interpret and manipulate information in an increasingly wide variety of formats so

that data and processing software can be brought together in a compatible but also

timely and effective way (Kadel, [0008]).

18.   As for claim 13, Heller discloses:

A computer readable medium (inherent in web server, Page 177, Lines 22-24) , which when executed on a computer performs a method for providing an extensible educational system, the method comprising:

displaying a user interface (GUI, Page 96, Line 12);

add new functionality to the extensible system (the archive called Smart.jar, Page 883, Line 24, MyAppletStuff.jar, Page 179, lines 19-22, and Java Applications and web server, Page 18, line 1 and Page 177, Lines 22-24); and

invoking an authentication interface configured (SmartCardPermission.java contains the Permission subclass, Page 878, Lines 27-28 and Page 882, lines 27-33) to verify a role of a user in the extensible system (the permissions related to—typically, either a single person or a group, Page 888, Lines 11-12, Page 878, Lines 27-28, and Page 882, lines 27-33), and grant or deny a user access to the new functionality based on the role of the user in the extensible system (access to SmartCard, Page 878, Lines 23-28).

However, Heller does not explicitly disclose:

an extensible system is an educational system;

an authentication user interface; and

invoking a plug-in manager configured to add new functionality to the extensible system.

On the other hand, Parker discloses:

an extensible system is an educational system (the multimedia educational

system of the present invention, Col. 8, lines 38-41); and

an authentication user interface (the student signs on in step 208, Col. 8, line 65

and FIG. 3A),

and Kadel discloses:

invoking a plug-in manager configured to add new functionality to the extensible

system ([0291] and [0082], lines 18-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was

made to combine the teachings of Heller with the teachings of Parker and Kadel by

having a system to be an educational system, having an authentication user interface,

and invoking a plug-in manager configured to add new functionality to the extensible

system in order to provide prospective students more choices for education, to reduce

financial burdens for students to have training and education (Parker, Col. 1, lines 22-

44), to control access to system resources (Heller, last two paragraphs of Page 848),

and to interpret and manipulate information in an increasingly wide variety of formats so

that data and processing software can be brought together in a compatible but also

timely and effective way (Kadel, [0008]).

19.   As for claims 10 and 14, Heller discloses:

the role of a user (permissions, Page 878, Lines 27-28 and Page 882, lines 27-

33) comprises at least one of: user administrator, course administrator, system support,

observer, support, portal administrator, system administrator, instructor, student and

teacher's assistant (read keys, write a key, write a certificate, read a certificate, read

medical notes, and read emergency notes, Page 882, Lines 18-23).

20.   As for claims 12 and 16, Heller discloses:

the user interface (GUI, Page 96, Line 12) is displayed by installing one or more

files (MyAppletStuff.jar, Page 179, lines 19-22) on a server (web server, Page 177,

Lines 22-24).

21.   Claims 8, 11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Heller and Parker in view of Kadel, and further in view of Govi et al. (Venkat Govi,

Hernan Eguiluz, You Jung Kim, and Adrain Sia, "System test plan", June 8, 2002,

retrieved from

http://dogbert.mse.cs.cmu.edu/mse2002/projects/pamd1/Working%20Document/PUMA

SystemTestPlan_v.1.0.doc on September 4, 2007), hereinafter "Govi".

22.   As for claims 8, 11, and 15, Parker discloses:

the authentication user interface is invoked using the user interface (the student

signs on in step 208, Col. 8, line 65 and FIG. 3A),

and Govi discloses:

the plug-in manager is invoked using the user interface (Pages 10-11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was

made to combine the teachings of Heller and Kadel with the teachings of Parker and

Govi by invoking the authentication user interface and the plug-in manager using the

user interface in order to control access to system resources (Heller, last two

paragraphs of Page 848) and to interpret and manipulate information in an increasingly

wide variety of formats so that data and processing software can be brought together in

a compatible but also timely and effective way (Kadel, [0008]).

Response to Arguments

23.   Regarding applicant's remark ("Objections to the Claims", Page 6 of 11) with

respect to claim objections, the previous claim objections are hereby withdrawn in view

of the amendments to claims 1, 2, 4, and 5.

24.   Regarding applicant's remark (A) with respect to "roles" and "enhanced system

functionality" (first paragraph of Page 8 of 11 and paragraphs 1 and 3 of Page 9 of 11),

examiner respectfully traverses applicant's argument. Heller teaches how to use

permissions to control a user to access SmartCard's functionalities (Page 863, lines 28-

30, Page 878, lines 22-28, and Page 888, lines 8-12). Therefore, it clearly indicates that

"permissions" here perform the same function as "roles" recited in the claim. Also, Heller

teaches system functionalities provided by the Smart Card program (Page 878, lines

23-30). When the Smart Card program is installed on a system, it provides enhanced

functionalities to the system. So it clearly indicates Heller teaches "enhanced system functionality" as recited in the claim.

25.   Applicant's other remarks have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Songwei Qian whose telephone number is 571-270-

1910. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (alternative Friday off 8:00am thru 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SQ
09/04/2007

WEI ZHEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER